DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 239 226 CS 007 474

AUTHOR Crismore, Avon
TITLE The Rhetoric of Social Studies Textbooks: Metadiscourse.
PUB DATE [83]
NOTE 35p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Comparative Analysis; Content Analysis; *Content Area Reading; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; *Readability; *Reading Materials; Rhetorical Criticism; *Social Studies; *Textbook Research; *Textbooks
IDENTIFIERS *Metadiscourse; Reader Text Relationship; Textual Analysis

ABSTRACT

Written authorial commentary, or metadiscourse, in social studies texts helps students anticipate context, goals, text organization, and author perspective, and results in texts that readers find interesting and easy to remember. An analysis of informational and attitudinal metadiscourse instances in nine social studies textbooks and nine nontextbooks representing levels from elementary school through college produced a number of findings, including the following: (1) typical textbooks did not make goal statements and infrequently used preliminary or preplan statements about content or structure, or postplan review statements; (2) two of the three atypical textbooks (textbooks written for specialized audiences) did use goal statements; (3) of the nonschool texts, four had goal statements, one had 84 of 106 nontextbook preplan statements, and three had postplan statements; (4) typical textbooks used third person, formulaic discourse statements more often than atypical or nonschool texts; (5) nonschool texts used attitudinal discourse more often than did school texts; (6) the greatest amount of attitudinal discourse in school texts was found at the seventh and eighth grade level; and (7) textbooks generally use attitudinal discourse to refer to concrete people or events while nontextbooks also use it to refer to abstract concepts. (MM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED239226

The Rhetoric of Social Studies Textbooks: Metadiscourse

Avon Crismore

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Avon Crismore
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CS 007 474

Writers of social studies textbooks, like other writers, belong to a rhetorical community, a community of writers with shared knowledge, beliefs, values and interests that set the norm for the content and the style of their work. Because of societal pressures, the nature of rhetorical communities changes over the years and so do the norms. The content included and emphasized in today's social studies textbooks is quite different from that of the early part of the century.[1] Of course, textbook styles, the various ways the writers can present the content, change also, and writers of social studies textbooks must be concerned with style as well as content if they wish to write what Kantor, Anderson, and Armbruster call, "considerate texts."[2]

Considerate texts are texts accessible to readers. Many inconsiderate texts <u>can</u> be read, it is true, if readers are willing to expend the time and energy needed, but most textbook readers are not that committed. Considerate texts have been written following the rhetorical principles of unity, structure, development, coherence, emphasis appropriate for the subject matter and writer's purpose, and language appropriate for the reader. They have followed, in addition, the Gricean maxims for quantity, quality, relevancy, and manner needed for effective communication.[3] Writers of considerate texts are aware that readers who are unfamiliar with the subject matter or the conventions of a particular genre may need more explicit guidance and information; or they may need a text that requires fewer higher order inferences or a text that establishes an interpersonal relationship between writer and reader. In other words, writers might decide to use a rhetorical style different from one suitable for older, more experienced, or more knowledgeable readers.

The most common rhetorical style chosen by American social studies textbook writers is one sometimes referred to as "textbookese." It is an

objective, unelaborated, straightforward style with an anonymous, authoritative "author" reporting a body of facts in one proposition after another. But there is another rhetorical style--a more natural style making use of a text characteristic called metadiscourse that has implications for social studies writers. This paper will define metadiscourse, explain why social studies writers might or might not use it, and then report and discuss the findings of a systematic analysis of metadiscourse use in nine social studies texts written for students and nine written for adults no longer in school.

PART I: WHAT IS METADISCOURSE?

All informative texts have propositional content--the ideational part we can call the primary discourse. However, some texts also have another level, the content-less level called metadiscourse. Metadiscourse is, simply, an author's discoursing about the discourse; it is the author's intrusion into the discourse, either explicitly or non-explicitly, to direct rather than inform the readers. Metadiscourse can be considered directives given to readers so they will understand what is said and meant in the primary discourse and so they know how to "take" the author.[4] This content-less writing about writing includes comments about the discourse plans, the author's attitudes, the author's confidence in his following assertion, and the use of self-references and references to the readers--the interpersonal part.

The function of metadiscourse can be viewed as a metacommunicative function. Metadiscourse is a discourse whose subject (either explicitly or implicitly) is both codification of the message and the relationship between the communicators.[5] It is a level of structure important in any

description of rhetorical styles that are available to social studies writers and that influence readers.[6]

The advantages of metadiscourse are that it permits writers to make announcements to the reader about "coming attractions," changing the subject, asserting something with or without certainty, pointing out an important idea, noting the existence of a reader, and expressing an attitude toward an event. The disadvantages are that it can bury the primary message if used too mechanically or obtrusively, or cause readers to react negatively to the text. Many American composition textbooks assume all readers react negatively to these announcements and so caution writers against using, for example, I think or in my opinion. Most communication scholars, however, believe that when used appropriately, metadiscourse (these comments also called signaling or signposts) can serve to guide and direct readers through a text by helping them understand the text and the author's perspective. Of course, it can also serve to impede understanding if used excessively or inappropriately.

Why Metadiscourse Might or Might Not be Used

Commager points out that history has two meanings--the past and the memory of the past, and two kinds of historians--the literary historian and the scientific, technical historian. According to Commager, the gap between the literary and the scientific is not just stylistic; it is deeper and more fundamental, a difference in the philosophy itself. The literary historian is interested in recreating the past for its own sake, so he is interested in the drama, the spectacle, the pageant, actors and actresses. The scientific historian has more prosaic and realistic purposes. It is reason he wants to excite, not imagination. The past is to be explained, not recreated. The evolutionary process of history and problem solving

concern him. Commager notes, however, that:[7]

> Let us admit at once that history is neither scientific nor mechanical, that the historian is human, and therefore fallible, and that the ideal history, completely objective and dispassionate, is an illusion. There is bias in the choice of a subject, bias in the selection of material, bias in organization and presentation, and inevitably bias in interpretation. (p. 53)

and, in addition, states that:

> Actually partisanship often adds zest to historical writing; for partisanship is an expression of interest and excitement and passion, and these can stir the reader as judiciousness might not. (p. 55)

The point Commager makes is that history is always, in some ways, biased and when authors are overt about their biases it helps readers become interested in history.

No doubt social science areas other than history also have the literary and scientific approaches, too, reflected in the text written by the authorities in these fields who use their preferred approach. Because this is so, we might expect to find differences because of the individual writing styles of the authors, their beliefs and assumptions about social studies, the background and age of the readers, and the purposes of the texts (e.g., to give new information or to persuade, if the information is known to both author and readers).

In school textbooks, the publisher and author may want to use metadiscourse to help the reader reconstruct the author's writing plan, or serve as advance organizers or reminders, to help him set up expectations, confirm them, and integrate the text. They may decide to use metadiscourse in order to help the reader become an independent reader who can learn from the text because he is an "insider" concerning the topic, thesis, purpose, author stance, significance, organization, sequencing, discourse type and method of development.

Social studies pedagogic theory might also influence decisions to use metadiscourse. Social studies educators assume, apparently, that the typical social studies textbook should be a body of facts without exposition like math problems, facts to be memorized by the reader like the multiplication tables. The role of the textbook writer, then, is to report the facts, not explain them or their significance for the reader and certainly not to explain the writer's plan for reporting the facts or his point of view. The role of the student reader is to receive the facts passively from the truthgiving authority who wrote the text and memorize them, not to understand the facts or the writer's attitude towards them and not to use the facts in building a larger picture or to think critically about what the writer said or did in the textbook.

Another assumption that seems prevalent in social studies pedagogy is that knowledge and certainty are what count, not inquiry, exploration, creativity, and tentativeness. Booth has pointed out the tendency of our culture to value objectivism and to dismiss--as mere belief without value--everything that is not verifiable fact.[8] A rhetorical community which polarizes "fact" and value, ignoring probability—the ground between objectivity and faith or feelings--and which extols certainty and a rhetoric of conclusions, rewards the mastery of verifiable information. In such a rhetorical community, textbook writers would find no encouragement to write textbooks that included inquiry or probable judgments. Both of these assumptions would no doubt have an effect on the use of metadiscourse in textbooks.

In addition, there might be a belief by the social studies writers and publishers that teachers do the metadiscoursing in the classroom, perhaps with the aid of the teacher's edition or manual. In that case, the teachers (if they read the teacher's manual) are the "insiders," not the

student reader, and the student reader is completely dependent on the teacher. Or writers and publishers might believe that student readers should be "semi-independent" readers and that titles, text-embedded questions, and end of chapter or unit remarks are a kind of implicit metadiscourse to be used along with teacher metadiscourse. If they believe, however, that students should be independent readers and that teachers and implicit metadiscourse in manuals and textbooks are not dependable, they would more likely use explicit metadiscourse. These possibilities raise some interesting questions that might be answered by studying metadiscourse use.

Finally, textbook writers and publishers may decide not to use metadiscourse because of readability formulae constraints. These readability formulae, based on word length, word familiarity, and sentence length and complexity, are used as indices of text difficulty. Although they were intended to be applied to what had already been written, they are now being used inappropriately by textbook writers as they write. The sentence length constraint means that there is no room for metadiscourse since metadiscourse increases sentence length. Therefore, textbook writers and publishers would decide, no doubt, to spend the number of words permitted on the primary discourse, covering as many disciplines and topics as possible.

PART II: A STUDY OF METADISCOURSE USE IN SCHOOL TEXTS

Introduction

Written authorial commentary (metadiscourse) has a long history in fiction, beginning with the earliest novelists like Henry Fielding, and has been studied by literary critics. However, the situation is different for non-fiction. For example, no one seems to have studied metadiscourse in

school texts. Therefore, I decided to create a typology of metadiscourse based on the functions of language and rhetorical techniques, and then examine how it is used by social studies writers.

My typology included two general categories, the informational and attitudinal, with several subtypes for each. One of the assumptions of those who study language use and social interaction is that language functions to transmit referential information as well as to create and sustain expressive meanings. I assumed that not only primary discourse but also metadiscourse is used for both referential and expressive ends. Metadiscourse functions on a referential, informational plane when it serves to direct readers how to understand the author's purposes and goals and the primary message by referring to its content and structure. The referring can be on a global or local level. Metadiscourse functions on an expressive, or attitudinal plane when it serves to direct readers how to "take" the author, that is, how to understand the author's perspective or stance toward the content or structure of the primary discourse.

Informational Metadiscourse

Authors can give several types of information about the primary discourse to readers for better comprehension. They can explicitly signal their goal or goals; the topic or subject matter; topic shifts; the main assertion about the topic (the thesis or controlling idea); the significance or rationale for the main assertion; and the discourse type sequence, organization, and development plans. The informative metadiscourse can be in the form of preliminary or review statements--This is what I am planning to say and/or do or This is what I said or did--looking ahead or looking back on a global or local discourse level. I used three subtypes of informative metadiscourse for the analysis: (a) global

goal statements (both preliminary and review) called goals, (b) global preliminary statements about content structure, called pre-plans, (c) global review statements about content and structure, called post plans. Examples of each subtype make the distinctions easier to see. The metadiscourse is underlined.

Goals: Our goal in this unit is to enrich the way readers think about American Indians.

Pre plans: This chapter is about Indians.

Postplans: We have argued earlier that the arrival of the Europeans began to destroy the Indian's life style.

Attitudinal Metadiscourse

Authors can also explicitly or implicitly signal their attitude toward the content or structure of the preliminary discourse and toward the readers. They can give directives to readers about the importance or salience of certain points or parts of their primary discourse from their perspective, about the degree of certainty they have for their assertions and beliefs, about how they feel about the content of the message, and about the distance they wish to put between themselves and the readers. The author commentary here is evaluative and expressive rather than referential and informational. I used four subtypes of attitudinal metadiscourse for the analysis: (a) importance of idea, called saliency, (b) degree of certainty of assertion, called emphatics, (c) degree of uncertainty, called hedges, (d) attitude toward a fact or idea, called evaluative. The following examples illustrate these subtypes.

Saliency: Still more important as a call to reform were . . .

Emphatics: This, of course, is an oversimplification of the slavery problem.

Hedges: Perhaps, worst of all was the corruption in the cities.

Evaluative: Unfortunately, most Americans do not vote as often as they could.

Metadiscourse can consist, then, of WORDS such as unfortunately or probably, PHRASES such as let us now turn to or so far as strategic planning was concerned, or CLAUSES such as this chapter is about Indians, remember that farming was the main way of making a living or I think it is interesting that the villages were spared. In addition, metadiscourse can be stated from different points of view such as (a) first person, I think or (b) second person, Remember that or You will read that, or (c) third person, This chapter is about or The purpose of this unit is to. The longer metadiscourse phrases and sentences indicate more explicitly the author's presence in the discourse while shorter metadiscourse words such as luckily or clearly indicate a more subtle presence of the author. A text can vary in the types, the amount or length of metadiscourse, the "person" used for the metadiscourse with the focus on the author/narrator (first person), the reader (second person), the author and reader (first and second person) or the text (third person). The amount and kind of metadiscourse and person used for it in a text can be viewed as an index of author presence, author personality, and the author/reader relationship. The use of metadiscourse is a stylistic variable--some authors use much, some use little.

Because I thought this surface, stylistic variable had implications for social studies texts, and might also be an indicator of deeper underlying social studies pedagogical beliefs and values, I decided to study the way social studies textbook and nontextbook writers use or don't use the informational and attitudinal subtypes of metadiscourse. The

present study was an initial attempt to answer several questions about metadiscourse use. Only one question will be addressed in this paper, however: Are there differences in the amount and types of metadiscourse used by social studies writers in materials used for school and non-school purposes?

Description of the Materials and Sample Selection

I chose 18 texts for this study, nine social studies textbooks and nine non-textbook texts. All levels of school were represented with the textbooks--early elementary, middle school, junior high, high school and college. Of the nine textbooks, six can be considered typical and three atypical. The six typical ones are published by leading publishers and are widely used. The three atypical textbooks are not published by leading publishers and/or are not widely used. Of the nine non-school texts, eight can be considered typical texts written for either a general or a specialized audience and one considered atypical because it was a report of a large research study written for a specialized audience (see Figure 1).

Figure 1

Textbook and Nontextbook Information

The nine textbooks and nine nontextbooks are the following: (Abbreviations are enclosed in brackets.)

Textbooks

1. (atypical) Chicago--The City and Its People by Muriel Stanek, Elementary (Grade 3) School Principal (Benefic Press, Chicago, Illinois, 1981). [Chicago]

2. (typical) Social Studies by Dr. Barbara M. Parramore and Dan D'Amelio (Grade 4) (Scott, Foresman and Company, Glenview, Illinois, 1979). [Soc. Stud.]

3. (typical) The United States: Living in Our World (Grade 5) by consulting Social Scientists (Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, New York, 1980). [The U.S.]

4. (typical) Our World by G. S. Dawson, E. V. Tiegs, & F. Adams (Grade 6) (Ginn and Company, Lexington, Mass., 1979). [Our World]

5. (atypical) Indians in the American System: Past and Present by Ian Westbury and (Grades 7 & 8) Susan Westbury (The Laboratory School, the University of Chicago, The Graduate School of Education, no date--probably 1974). [Indians]

6. (typical) America: Its People and Values by L. C. Wood, R. H. Gabriel (Grades 7 & 8), E. L. Biller (2nd edition), (Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, New York, New York, 1971). [America:]

7. (typical) Rise of the American Nation by L. P. Todd & M. Curti (Grades 9-12), (Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, New York, New York, 1980). [Rise]

8. (atypical) As It Happened: A History of the United States by C. G. Sellers, et al. (Grades 9-12 honours), (Webster Division, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, New York, 1975). [As It H.]

9. (typical) American History, Volume 1: To 1877, 5th Edition, by R. N. Current (College undergraduate), T. H. Williams, F. Freidel, Alfred A. (Knopf, New York, 1979). [Am. Hist.]

Non-textbooks

10. (typical, specialized audience) Theodore Roosevelt, President by Edmund Morris, American Heritage, 32, No. 4 (1981), pp. 4-15.

11. (typical, general audience) A Canoe Helps Hawaii Recapture Her Past by Herb Kane, National Geographic, 149, No. 4 (1976), pp. 468-489.

12. (typical, general audience) The Americans by Luigi Barzini, Harper's, 263, No. 1579 (1981), pp. 29-36+. [The Ams.]

13. (typical, specialized audience) Another look at the American Character by Emmet Fields, Soundings: An Interdisciplinary Journal, 65, No. 1 (1981), pp. 41-56. [Another L.]

14. (typical, specialized audience) Urbanization in Colonial Latin America by Susan Socolour and Lyman Johnson, Journal of Urban History, 8, No. 8, No. 1 (1981), pp. 27-59. [Urbaniz.]

15. (typical, general audience) The Defeat of America: Presential Power and the National Character by Henry S. Commager (Simon and Schuster, New York, New York, 1974). [The Defeat]

16. (typical, general audience) The Kennedy Imprisonment 2. The Prisoner of Toughness, on John F. Kennedy's Conception of Power by Garry Wills, The Atlantic Monthly, 249, No. 2 (1982), pp. 52-66. [Kennedy]

17. (typical, general audience) The Uprooted, by Oscar Hanlin (An Atlantic Monthly Press Book, Little, Brown and Company, Boston, 1951). [Uprooted]

18. (atypical, specialized audience) Participation in America: Political

Democracy and Social Equality by S. Verba and N. Nie (Harper & Row, New York, 1972). [Participation]

The sample of nine textbook and the units and chapters were chosen to represent a wide range of social science textbooks and materials found in them. I tried to include chapters that focused on geography and spatial relations, history of people, places, and events, anthropology, economics, sociology and political science. Some topics were held constant across some texts such as American Indians, slavery and the Civil War. One publisher was held constant, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, with textbooks written for elementary, junior high, and high school students in grades 5, 7-8, and 9-12.

The typical textbooks ranged from grade 4 through college and were considered typical in that they were "written" by multiple authors or editors with the aid of many educational and social studies specialists; were comprehensive, dealing with many topics in a survey fashion; and had the content, structure, and style of textbooks used in typical classrooms across the nation.

The three atypical texts were written for special populations. The grade 3 text was written for the children in a large urban school system (Chicago's) by a single author, a former school principal who was probably not a social science expert. The subject matter, Chicago, would be familiar and no doubt interesting to them. The text for grades 7 & 8 was written for students in a laboratory school by a husband and wife team, one a curriculum specialist in social studies. The high school text was written for students in advanced placement honors programs. Students in these programs have been selected on the basis of test scores and teacher judgments to take advanced college level courses, using more mature, complex textbooks. The authors made extensive use of original source

material in the textbook, commenting on the selections used. Students were expected to read and understand the primary sources mostly on their own.

The nine samples drawn from text written for a non-student, adult population were also chosen to represent a wide range of social science disciplines, topics, styles, audiences and types of text. Some texts are articles written for widely read periodicals, some are articles written for specialized academic journals, some are chapters or essays from books or monographs written for either a general audience or a specialized audience. Several were written by Pulitzer Prize-winning authors and distinguished scholars while others were written by journalists. Some authors used a literary approach and some a scientific approach. Some topics are more or less constant such as the American character, presidential character and power, democracy, and social equality.

Method for Text Analysis

The unit of analysis was a whole discourse chunk such as a unit, chapter, or article. Because the length of units or chapters increases through the grades for textbooks and because initial chapters might vary from middle or final chapters, the selection of units or chapters varies in number and location. Each unit, chapter or article was examined and analyzed for instances of the three subtypes of informational metadiscourse (goals, pre-plans, and post-plans) and the four subtypes of attitudinal metadiscourse (saliency, emphatics, hedges, and evaluatives). (The chunks range in length from 1,000 words in the Chicago text to 12,000 words in the high school and college textbooks and non-textbook samples.) In order to compare textbook instances and non-textbook instances, it was necessary to use a 1,000 word unit as a base since the text units were not the same length. The quantitative data presented will be frequency of metadiscourse

instances per 1,000 words.

All word counts are approximations based on number of words per inch of text. Quantitative information is necessary for indicating the existence of and relative emphasis given to different metadiscourse types in the samples. Purely quantitative analysis cannot, however, convey the flavor of the text materials. This can only be done qualitatively. The categories chosen for quantitative analysis need qualitative illustration by direct quotation in order to see presentation style and patterns of use. In order to assess the degree of author presence in the text, the point of view or "person" used for the metadiscourse was also examined and will be discussed. Examples of these categories and point of view will be found in the sections that follow.

Informational Metadiscourse Findings

Goals. No goal statements were found in any of the typical social studies textbooks. Goal statements are usually found in prefaces or introductions to a book, theme, or chapter or else in the concluding sections of a book, unit, chapter or section. The typical textbook did not contain prefaces or sections called "To the Student" with one exception, where the prologue told the student the topics to be covered but no goals, purposes, or aims. However, two of the three atypical texts did have goal statements as shown below. (The brackets enclose shortened titles of the texts. See Figure 1.)

[Indians] This is our goal in this book. We want to look at the prehistory of Indian culture in America to see the ways in which Indian peoples learned to exploit the land in which they lived. We want to look at the course of Indian-white relations in America to explore what happened when a stone-age culture faced an acquisitive white culture that was more highly developed and had more resources than did Indian culture. We want also to examine

the legacy of this contact which in large part we cannot understand either unless we try to see more clearly than before.

In the nontextbook samples, four of the nine used goal statements, which are illustrated in the following examples.

[Defeat] They [these essays] seek to explain, or at least to illuminate, the implications of that collapse for our political and constitutional fabric and to interpret its consequences for our moral fabric. (p. 9)

[Uprooted] I hope to seize upon a single strand woven into the fabric of our past, to understand that strand in its numerous ties and linkages with the rest; and perhaps by revealing the nature of this part, to throw light upon the essence of the whole. (p. 3)

[Participation] We have, in this book, attempted to pursue both goals: to say something about the processes of politics in general and something about American politics at the beginning of the 1970's in particular. (p. xix)

Notice that [Indians], [Uprooted], and [Participation] use the first person, thus indicating the presence of real authors with real goals and purposes. [Defeat] uses third person so that the text rather than the author seeks to explain; the text is personified and the distance between author and reader increases. There is a difference in the styles of both [Defeat] and [Uprooted] and the rest in that figurative language is used. Commager, the author of [Defeat] and Hanlon, the author of [Uprooted], use a literary style while the others use a prosaic, plain style. [Uprooted] also makes use of hedges--hope and perhaps. The analysis suggests that typical textbook writers do not use goal statements but that atypical textbook and non-textbook writers do often use them and that the typical textbook is bland in comparison to the typical non-textbooks.

Pre-plans. A total of 82 plan statements concerning the content or structure were found in the textbook sample, but 58 of the 82 were found in

two of the atypical textbooks. The data show no use of pre-plans in the lower grades but an increased use of pre-plans as students get into the middle and junior high and then a decline.

The situation seems to be the reverse for the non-textbook samples. Although there were a total of 106 instances, 84 of them were found in the one atypical text. This high frequency could be accounted for by the fact that this text is a report of a study of citizen participation. Perhaps research reports make greater use of pre-plans, or perhaps it was just these particular authors' style. Three of the texts had none: [Canoe], [The Ams.], and [Kennedy]. [Canoe] was written by a native Hawaiian, [The Ams.] by an Italian journalist, and [Kennedy] by an American journalist. Perhaps their culture or professions influenced their decision not to use pre-plans. [Defeat] and [Uprooted], both written by the literary historians, made little use of pre-plans. If we examine the typical textbooks that used any and the non-textbook writers who used any (excluding [participation]), the non-textbook writers show a lower frequency of use than the typical textbook writers. What is interesting is the high frequency for the two atypical textbook writers [Indians] and [As It H.]. The writers seem intent on letting the student readers "in" on their plans for the text, making the plans explicit. Examples of typical textbook pre-plans follow:

[Indians]

(a) The first chapter discusses the kinds of ideas people have of other groups of people.

(b) Presented first is a description of the background of the situation.

[As It H.]

(a) Preface--the book has been divided into eight units.

(b) This first unit uses material from the earliest part of the nation's history—the colonial period--to raise questions that are still important today.

Here is an example of atypical textbook pre-plan statement:

[The U.S.] In this unit you will find out about the struggles the United States faced during the first ninety years of its history. (p. 1)

The non-school texts used pre-plans such as these:

[Participation] (a) We consider two general political processes: that by which citizens come to participate in political life and that by which their participation affects the responsiveness of governmental leaders. This involves the explication of some general variables . . .

(b) Our main concern is with participation as an instrumental act by which citizens influence the government.

[Urbaniz.] After reviewing the model for sixteenth-century urbanization, the chronology of town founding in the New World, and the physical prototype of the colonial city, we will discuss topics such as class structure, economic function, and urban political life. (p. 27)

[Defeat] These are the interlocking themes of this collection of essays: . . . (p. 16)

[Uprooted] I shall touch upon broken homes, interruptions of a familiar life, separation from known surroundings, the becoming a foreigner and ceasing to belong. (p. 4)

The style of the typical textbook pre-plan statements are very different from the style of the atypical and non-textbook preplans. There is a formulaic quality to the typical textbook preplans (e.g., In this chapter you will see about how X). The focus is on the reader with the read / learn / find out pronoun you used.

The atypical writers not only present the topic in the pre-plans (which is all the typical writers do except but also indicate the discourse type, the speech act, and plan for the text sequence (e.g., discusses the kinds of ideas, presented first is a description, divided into eight units,

uses material . . . to raise questions). These writers explicitly tell the readers "This is what I'll talk about and this is what I am going to do and how I'll do it." These are say and do plans. The same is true for the non-textbook writers (e.g., I will come back to it in more detail later, I will be exploring shortly, the character, we will provide an overview, we will discuss topics such as, I have tried to historically trace, we consider the general political processes). The atypical and non-textbook writers do not use you, but I, we, our or this chapter. The two atypical writers use the third person, This chapter, The book, This first unit, presented first is, while the non-textbook writers all use first person except [Defeat]. The effect of the different choices of person for the preplans is that the author is flattened out in the textbooks--the focus is on the reader in the typical texts, and on the text itself in the atypical texts. The author's presence is strongly felt in the non-textbook preplans. There is more variety of preplans and types of information in both the atypical and non-textbook texts, so they might be more interesting and helpful to read. The use of first person would probably engage the reader in the text more, too.

Post-plans. When no instances of preplans were found in texts, no instances of post-plans were found either. Textbook writers use both pre- and post-plan statements or none. However, post plans are usually used less often than pre-plans. There was no clear trend toward increased use of post-plans in the upper grade texts. The following typical examples illustrate the kinds of post plan statements found in these textbooks:

[Our World]	We have seen that textile mills and iron and steel plants needed Pennine coal. (p. 174)
[Indians]	We have already looked at the statistics about Indian life which mark this failure. (p. 60)

[America] As you have read in Chapter 10, Congress found a solution when Henry Clay and other leaders proposed the Missouri Compromise of 1820. (p. 434)

[Rise] As you recall, Mexico ceded to the United States a huge area of land in the Southwest--the Mexican Cession. (p. 315)

The examples illustrate that what was true for the pre-plan statements is also true for the post plans: the typical textbook writers use only second person you and use a formulaic approach--As you have read, In studying X, you have learned Y, we have seen that X is the case (the use of we here is a 'phony' first person of a rather condescending sort), As you recall. It makes one wonder how readers react to this practice. Readers are always students. They read, remember, recall, study, and learn. Do they ever feel intimidated or threatened at the presuppositions of the writers? "Gosh, maybe I did read that in Chapter 10, but I sure don't remember it--what's wrong with me?" The atypical examples show a different style. In [Indians], the focus is on the authors and readers: we have already looked at; or on the authors alone, we have mentioned that. Again the post plans like the pre-plans are reminders of what the authors said or talked about and what the authors did. [As It H.] is closer to the typical textbook (e.g., The sources give you some insight; (you) Recall James Otis). The focus is on the reader, but there is not the same degree of burden on the reader, and there is variety of presentation--not the formulaic approach.

Only three of the nine non-textbook samples showed evidence of post plans, indicating that non-textbook authors use pre-plans about three times as often as they do post-plans. If [Participation] is excluded, it appears that textbook writers used more post plans than do the non-textbook writers. The examples that follow show how the typical post-plan statement

was written by these non-textbook writers:

[T. R., Pres.] As I have noted earlier, T. R.'s militarism did not loom large during his presidency. (p. 15)

[Participation] As we pointed out, we have taken a narrower view than some as to what participate is. (p. 22)

The author is again prominent in these post-plans and the author or authors remind the readers of what was said or done. The author has pointed out, noted, suggested, demonstrated, or argued. This is a quite different set of verbs than that used by the textbook writers. The focus here is on the author or authors, not the reader.

Summary for Informational Metadiscourse

Typical textbooks did not use goals but two of the three atypical ones did. Four of the non-textbooks used goals but the authors of the research study used more than the other three.

The examples showed that there were qualitative differences in the types of informational metadiscourse used in materials for school and non-school purposes. Typical textbooks used third person formulaic expressions and concentrated on subject matter for pre- and post-plans. Atypical textbooks and non-textbooks used first person or both first and second person, did not use formulaic expressions and concentrated on subject matter and structure or speech events in goals, pre- and post-plans.

The research question asked whether there were differences in the amount and types of metadiscourse use in school and non-school social studies texts. The quantitative and qualitative data from these 18 texts suggest that the answer is yes for these texts and perhaps also for other texts like them as far as informational metadiscourse use is concerned. It is hard to conclude anything from such a small amount of data, but the suggestive results for informational metadiscourse leads to questions about

the other major kind of metadiscourse, attitudinal. Is the situation the same or different? What is the answer to the research question for attitudinal metadiscourse?

Attitudinal Metadiscourse Findings

The use of attitudinal metadiscourse is quite different from the use of informational metadiscourse. If all types of informational metadiscourse are collapsed, it appears that over all sample texts, based on frequency per 1000 words, non-textbooks used more informative metadiscourse (1.85) than textbooks (1.17) but the differences are not very large. There are larger differences in the use of attitudinal metadiscourse, however. Non-textbooks used attitudinal types over five times as often (4.32) as did the textbooks (.81), again based on frequency per 1000 words.

Salience. None of the textbooks for Grades 3-6 used saliency metadiscourse, the type that explicitly uses words like important or primary to indicate the author feels that an idea or event is salient and important. This finding was surprising. Apparently the authors presented all ideas as equally important to the students or used non-explicit ways of indicating importance. Many more saliency statements were found in the typical textbooks for grades 7-8 than for the atypical 7-8 or for high school or college, a text-specific feature, no doubt. The others used saliency about the same amount. Although three of the non-textbooks did not contain saliency statements, the other six did use it, and used it to a greater degree than did the textbooks, about twice as much. The atypical non-textbook research report authors used it much more than the typical non-textbook authors or the atypical textbook authors. The way saliency statements were typically expressed in textbooks and non-textbooks is seen

in these examples:

[Indians]	We can see how important it is to know exactly where all the finds discovered in a site were located by looking at some of the findings from the Schultz excavation. (p. 12)
[Rise]	More important, the Free-Soilers won 12 seats in the House of Representatives. (p. 315)
[T. R., Pres.]	The most fundamental characteristic of Theodore Roosevelt was his aggression--conquest being, to him, synonymous with growth. (p. 7)
[The Ams.]	The Americans' sense of mission and pride, their confidence in their power and invincibility, but above all, their pragmatism, . . .
[Uprooted]	As important perhaps was the fact that Wilson had never really broken through the limitations of the traditional reformer. (p. 225)
[Participation]	This distinction is important, especially in an era when so much attention is focused on the political mobilization of citizens in the "support" sense. (p. 2)

Because there are so few examples of saliency for the textbook samples, it is difficult to say anything qualitatively about the differences in use for the two kinds of texts. One difference might be the tendency for the textbooks to use saliency to refer to concrete people or events more than abstract concepts and ideas. In the textbooks we see that Railroads are important, Wounded Knee is important, etc. In the non-textbook examples, saliency for concrete nouns wasn't noted--saliency was given only to abstract nouns. Both textbooks and non-textbooks used saliency to point out the importance of concepts and ideas (e.g., Problems are serious, knowing the exact location of all sites is important, winning 12 seats of Free-Soilers is important, preachings are important, characteristics are fundamental, pragmatism, above all, prevented them, survival is explained primarily, the fact that Wilson had never . . . is as important). Because the non-textbooks are not survey courses and therefore

treat the subject matter in depth, saliency is also communicated to the reader with the number of words devoted to the subject and amount of repetition, as well as explicitly telling readers that something is salient. It seems strange, then, that the textbooks, lacking the depth, detail, and redundancy did not use more saliency to explicitly mark important events and concepts. Another difference is the lack of overt author presence for the typical textbooks.

Emphatics. This type of attitudinal metadiscourse indicates how certain an author is of the primary message. It is characteristic of persuasive and argumentative writing because the author uses concessives such as True or It is true that X is the case; but Y is; or clearly X is the case; still, Y is. Authors also use emphatics such of course, indeed, actually, or in fact to emphasize that what they are propounding should be believed.

For the textbooks, I found that about three times as many emphatic statements were used as saliency statements. The atypical textbooks for grades 7-8 and 9-12+ used more emphatics than the typical textbooks. In the typical textbooks, most of the emphatics were found in the textbooks for grades 7-8 and college. The highest frequency of emphatic statements was found in the atypical high school textbooks. The textbooks for grades 3, 4, and 6 had no instances of emphatics and grade 5 had only one instance. The non-textbooks, however, used a great deal more of the emphasizers than did the textbooks.

All of the non-textbooks showed a high incidence of emphatics use, more than any other attitudinal metadiscourse. The non-textbooks with the highest frequency use were [Participation] and [The Ams.] from Harper's. The lowest amount of emphatics was found in [Canoe] from National Geographic which was still higher than the amount found in the atypical

textbook with the highest amount. The non-textbook writers apparently feel free to intrude on their primary discourse frequently to comment on the believability and certainty of their statements of fact while the textbook writers do not. The reason may either be that readers of non-textbook materials are older and more critical readers, needing to be persuaded by the authors, or the authors want the emphatics to lend a note of informality and personality to the text. The textbook authors, since they are the authorities and young readers are not critical readers who are used to questioning authority figures, may not feel as great a need to use emphatics. Emphatics are used by a writer to persuade readers to "believe me." Textbook writers no doubt do not see themselves as needing to persuade young readers since they are the "truthgivers" for the content area called social science. The examples of representative expressions with emphatics follow:

[America]	As you would expect, the new party had almost all its strength in the North. (p. 433)
[As It H.]	In fact, once we have the concept of status in mind, we can see that status exists in most social groups. (p. 6)
[Am. Hist.]	Indeed, Poe's writings influenced European literature far more than did those of any other nineteenth-century American. (p. 319)

What seems characteristic of typical textbook emphatics use is the focus on the student, as we have seen before (e.g., As you would expect, Obviously you cannot); while the atypical use focuses on the authors and readers together or historians in general (e.g., We do know that; In fact, once we have the). It also seems that the typical textbook writers use the emphatics to point out the certainty of what other historians agree on rather than on a particular statement propounded by the author as his own statement of fact (e.g., Indeed, he [Calhoun] insisted; In fact, the

Proclamation freed no slaves at all). Such statements are really verifiable statements while the ones expressed by the atypical and college textbook authors are opinions (e.g., The students' picture is; obviously wildly inaccurate; Indeed, Poe's writings influenced European literature).

Hedges. Hedges are used by both textbook and non-textbook authors about half as much as emphasizers. The same textbooks that lacked emphasizers also lacked hedges with the exception of [Chicago], which had two hedges. Interestingly, [America] had seven emphasizers but no hedges. The other textbooks had considerably fewer hedges than they did emphasizers. [As It H.] used 12 emphasizers but only two hedges and [Rise] used eight emphasizers but only four hedges. Although some non-textbooks used emphasizers and hedges about equally such as [Uprooted], (this is the only case of more hedges than emphasizers), most of the non-textbooks had far fewer hedges than emphasizers. [Defeat], for example, had 24 emphasizers but only one hedge. In general, the relationship between emphasizers and hedges was the same for both kinds of materials, although non-textbooks used much more of each type.

The following textbook examples illustrate what is characteristic of the use of hedges by the textbook writers. The typical textbook writers often use hedges to refer to what someone else thought about a situation or fact, a second order use of hedging (e.g., They had hoped the free state would let them go peacefully or perhaps meet Confederate demands; or To some is seemed that). Notice the use of third person or indefinite pronoun. In contrast, the atypical writers do not use others to hedge but do the hedging themselves, a first order hedging (e.g., There might have been fur traders before this, probably they spent another ten thousand, but it does seem clear that). The atypical writers used hedges directly; the

typical writers often use them attributively:

[Chicago]	There might have been fur traders before this. (p. 128)
[The U.S.]	They had hoped the free states would let them go peacefully or perhaps meet Confederate demands. (p. 163)
[Indians]	Probably they spent another ten thousand or more years moving slowly from Alaska through North and Central America to the southernmost part of the continent. (p. 60)
[Canoe]	The canoes probably exerted a "shaping" influence on their makers. (p. 475)
[Urbaniz.]	We suggest that, unwittingly, the late Bourbons were also creating a number of cities that, once they became centers of political discontent, became far more difficult to control. (p. 51)
[The Ams.]	Such solutions are the handiest and easiest, and may, of course, be the best, but may, occasionally, be the worst in a different context and time. (p. 34)

Several characteristics distinguish the nontextbook use of hedges. Nontextbooks seem to make more use of modals (may, might) and certain verbs (suggest, appears) and qualifiers (almost, generally). They frequently use the adverbials (possibly, probably) but also use the more formal constructions (It is probable that) at times, whereas the textbooks do not. The author is often present as the narrator (It seems to me, We suggest, I think that). Hedges are often used adjacent or close to emphatics with the effect of toning down the emphatics (may, of course); are often used in parentheses (and probably need), resulting in a more informal tone; and are used in conjunction with signals as but for the pro argument (perhaps understandable, but). The nontextbook writers use more hedges perhaps because they keep in mind that history is memory of the past rather than a record of the past and that many historians often disagree about issues such as causes for the Civil War. The textbook writers more often use flat

assertions:

[America] The war [Civil War] was different from earlier wars in its effects on the people.

Evaluative. The last of the attitudinal subtypes is evaluative, the type where authors intrude to comment on the content of the primary discourse propositions with expressions such as fortunately or oddly enough. Textbooks used evaluative metadiscourse less frequently than any other type of metadiscourse. This was found for both typical textbooks and atypical textbooks. The typical textbooks for grades 4-6 used no evaluatives at all while the textbook for grades 9-12 and the college text used only a few. The atypical textbook for grades 3 and 9-12+ used no evaluatives, but the one for grades 7-8 used several. The situation is different for the nontextbooks, however. Overall, the nontextbooks used about five times as many evaluatives as did the textbooks. Examples follow demonstrating evaluative use in textbooks and nontextbooks:

[Am. Hist.] The great dividing force was, ironically enough, the principal of state rights. (p. 384)

[Indians] Unfortunately, most Americans know far too little about the history; or the current problem of Indian Americans to be able to escape from the security of their stereotypes of Indians. (p. 2)

[Rise] Given these differences, it is not surprising that people in each of the three sections held radically different views about such issues as internal improvement at federal expense, tariffs . . . (p. 311)

[T. R., Pres.] --it is paradoxically so much a part of his virtues, both as a man and a politician, that I will come back to it in more detail later. (p. 4)

[Kennedy] Astonishingly, Theodore Sorensen wrote that after the failure of the invasion Kennedy was "grateful that he had learned so many major lessons . . ." (p. 54)

[Another L.] It is interesting to note that Turner saw us as having been determined by an environment that . . . (p. 45)

With so few instances of evaluatives used by textbook writers, it is hard to say much about the differences between their use in textbooks and nontextbooks. It is possible to point out that only on the college level does the evaluative ironically appear. Ironically like paradoxically indicates that the author feels a situation or expression is an example of irony or paradox, both complex attitudes or tones. Young students would no doubt find it difficult to understand irony or paradox because of its complexity and the fact that they probably have not been taught about these rhetorical devices. Evaluatives unfortunately and luckily are used in the atypical textbook for grades 7-8. Perhaps these feeling expressions are more simple and easy to understand for young students. The nontextbooks use both simple feelings or attitudes toward the subject matter such as unfortunately, astonishingly, what is striking, it is interesting to note, and it is not surprising as well as the complex attitudes such as paradoxically and ironically. Nontextbooks also use evaluatives such as properly speaking (which means technically) to comment on the prototypicalness or fuzziness of subject matter category. The main differences between the two kinds of texts seem to be the willingness of the nontextbook writers to make subjective judgments about the primary discourse content and the fact that the evaluatives used indicate both simple and complex attitudes.

Summary for Attitudinal Metadiscourse

The data shows that there are indeed differences in the amount and types of attitudinal metadiscourse used by authors in materials used for school and nonschool purposes. All four attitudinal types were used more often by the writers for nonschool purposes. What little attitudinal metadiscourse that was found in textbooks seemed to occur the most in the

textbooks for Grades 7-8, the same grade levels that used informational metadiscourse most frequently.

The qualitative data, the examples of attitudinal metadiscourse, also suggest that there are differences in the way they are used in textbooks and nontextbooks. Textbooks seem to use attitudinal metadiscourse to refer to concrete people or happenings in the primary discourse while nontextbooks use it to refer to abstract concepts as well as concrete phenomena. Another difference is the tendency of nontextbook writers to be present in text with first person for expressing attitudinal metadiscourse while the textbooks prefer more distance and use second or third person. A third difference is the large amount of emphatics and hedges used by nontextbook writers (individually and in pairs) to argue their points. The final difference is that textbook writers use simple evaluatives only (and very few of them) but nontextbook writers use both simple and complex evaluatives.

Conclusion

I have attempted in this paper to set up a useful, although not exhaustive, taxonomy of metadiscourse for social science materials in particular and for non-fiction in general. Both informational and attitudinal types of metadiscourse are, I believe, important to the fields of social studies writing and reading, for their use results in considerate texts for readers, texts that readers find communicative, interesting, and easy to read and remember. They help to create a mental set of anticipation for the reader--the reader anticipates content, goals, text structure and organization, topic shifts, and author perspective on the content, certainty of propositions and the text form. The informational subtypes can be considered structural pegs. Once anticipation has been

created, then metadisccurse draws the reader's attention to important points with the saliency subtype of attitudinal metadiscourse. The emphatic and hedge subtypes help readers make judgments about the author's claims, whether they are strong or weak, valid or invalid. Metadiscourse not only helps readers with motivation, arousal, entry into the text, attention, and saliency, but also with understanding the primary discourse. Readers need ways to symbolically represent and encode the discourse into long-term memory. Metadiscourse can be considered an inputting device or strategy that does this representing and encoding by providing a context in which the primary discourse can be embedded--a context for the text, in other words. The explicit metadiscourse post plans, reminders of old content and discourse structure information (and attitudinal?) form a basis for new information, new structures, and accommodation. Both explicit discourse and metadiscourse can help readers with accommodation through hierarchical relationships between old and new knowledge structures and facilitation for new structures. Of course, neither primary discourse nor metadiscourse can do everything--teachers are also important for guiding students. And, although too much metadiscourse may impede rather than enhance learning from textbooks, it <u>is</u> worthy of attention from social studies and reading educators, writers, publishers, and researchers.

All need to be concerned with the higher level rhetorical features such as goals; a point of view unfolded by an author who is visible and who has a personality; a thesis or controlling idea and continuity of topic; reasons and rationale for author beliefs; significance and importance statements for facts and beliefs; previews and reviews; introductions, development and conclusions; and updates on processing information. They need to ask themselves questions about critical reading: What happens to

critical reading (learning to evaluate and make judgments about truth conditions) when hedges and emphatics are absent? When bias is not overt (as it is not in textbooks) are young readers being deceived? What happens to critical reading when attitudinal metadiscourse is delayed until adulthood and readers are not encouraged to become active participants in the reading process? Educators, writers, and publishers need to be concerned not only with the content aspects but also the interpersonal aspects of social science textbooks and students--the tone, point of view, distance, and other stylistic aspects of non-fictional discourse. And they need to recognize that social science is subjective and interpretive and that social science authors are subjective and interpretive (some more than others). Young readers need to see author biases and evaluate them at an early age; textbooks and teachers need to teach them how to do this. Young readers need to learn about the domain of scholarship at an early age--where ideas come from, sources, citations, references, and bibliographies. Textbooks should model this.

Researchers need to ask about the optimum level of metadiscourse: How much of which type is needed by which students for which tasks under what conditions. They might want to investigate whether metadiscourse makes a textbook more or less interesting to readers and if so, which types; and whether reader judgments about interestingness persist over time. Perhaps the effect of metadiscourse on readers' attitudes toward the social science subject matter or domain should be studied. Metadiscourse offers empirical opportunities for investigating such issues.

In this paper, in addition to trying to define, describe, and classify metadiscourse, I have also made a first attempt at an empirical study of metadiscourse by looking at the frequency of use of each of the eight subtypes that I considered useful. The study is limited by the lack of

precision that exists in the definition of metadiscourse and the fuzziness of the boundaries between the different subtypes. Another problem is that metadiscourse, like primary discourse, can serve several functions simultaneously in a social situation. I hope, however, that I have in this exploratory study made some progress toward a theory of metadiscourse and laid some groundwork for future research.

References and Notes

1. Woodward, A., and Westbury, I. The response of textbooks to the development of the mass high school and its curriculum. Paper presented at the annual meeting of AERA; Montreal, 1983.

2. Armbruster, B. B., and Anderson, T. H. Content Area Textbooks. (Reading Education Report No. 23, Center for the Study of Reading, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign) ERIC ED 203 298.

3. Grice, H. P. Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & L. Morgan (eds.), Syntax and semantics (Vol. 3): Speech acts. New York: Academic Press, 1975.

4. Williams, J. Style, ten lessons in clarity and grace. (Scott, Foresman, Glenview, 1981).

5. Schiffren, D. Metatalk: Organizational and evaluative brackets in discourse. Sociological inquiry: Language and social interaction, 50(3-4) (1980), pp. 199-236.

6. Williams, J. Literary Style: the personal voice. In Shapen, T. and Williams, J. (eds.), Style and variables in English (Winthop, Cambridge, Mass., 1981).

7. Commager, H. S. The nature and the study of history. (Charles E. Merrill, Columbus, 1966).

8. Booth, W. C. Modern dogma and the rhetoric of assent. (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1974).